

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed January 6, 2006, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner next rejected claims 1, 5, 8-11, 13, 15, 16 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (USP 6,594,673 – hereinafter Smith) in view of San Andres et al. (USP 5,956,489 – hereinafter San Andres). Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12, 14 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Knight et al. (USP 6,721,748 – hereinafter Knight).

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, stating that “[t]he claim contains ‘detecting a post having a body and a subject header to a computerized bulletin board’ which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.” *Office Action, Jan. 03, 2006, p. 2*. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, one skilled in the art would recognize that a post having a body and subject header is described in the specification. Figure 1 discloses a GUI that includes a subject and/or title field. *See Specification, para. [0020]*. The GUI also includes a text area “which includes text related to the identified subject or title.” *Id.* Applicant believes that the specification reasonably conveys to one skilled in the art that Applicant had possession of the claimed invention. That is, one skilled in the art would recognize that the post having a body and subject header as called for in claim 1 conveys the GUI having a subject field and a text area. In fact, Smith discloses that the body of a newsgroup post or message “is the text information or file attachment in the post.” *Col. 7, lines 34-36*. As such, one skilled in the art would recognize that Applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. As such, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 8-11, 13, 15, 16 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of San Andres. The burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness under §103(a) falls on the Examiner. *MPEP §2142*. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *Id.* Applicant believes that the Examiner’s rejections of claims 1, 5, 8-11, 13, 15, 16, and 22 under §103(a) are defective. That is, the Examiner’s burden has not been met for reasons including that the Examiner failed to include San Andres in any of these rejections and that the Examiner failed to set forth any

motivation to modify or combine Smith and San Andres. As such, Applicant believes that the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness under §103(a) with regard to claims 1, 5, 8-11, 13, 15, 16, and 22. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8-11, 13, 15, 16 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Knight. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, the Examiner stated that Smith/Knight discloses: “a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave and representing a set of instructions which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to integrate a post with one or more computerized bulletin boards by: . . . automatically placing a copy of the post on another computerized bulletin board related to the another topic of interest (col. 6, lines 18-32, Smith).” *Office Action, Jan. 3, 2006, p. 10*. However, the Examiner’s characterization of the teachings and suggestions of Smith is incorrect and the cited section is unsupportive of the rejection. The section cited by the Examiner merely states:

In one implementation, the relative number of cross-posts between a core newsgroup 106 and a newsgroup 102 corresponds to the relative strength of the link 104 between the two groups. The relative strengths of links 104 may be represented by their lengths, with shorter links 104 corresponding greater numbers of cross-posts. Strong links 104 that correspond to relatively large numbers of cross-posts between groups may indicate similarities in the subject matter or topics covered by the two groups. Accordingly, inter-group visualization format 100 may be used as an indicator of the commonality in the subject matter of different newsgroups. A user familiar with the subject matter of a selected newsgroup 106 could identify from inter-group visualization format 100 other newsgroups 102 that might have related information or subject matter
Col. 6, lines 28-32.

Nowhere in this section does Smith teach or suggest that a processor is caused to automatically place a copy of a post on another computerized bulletin board related to another topic of interest. Rather, this section discloses inter-group visualization via links, the lengths of which correspond to the relative strength between groups.

For at least this reason, Applicant believes claim 17 is patentably distinct from the art of record. Accordingly, claims 18-21 are in condition for allowance at least pursuant to the chain of dependency.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-22.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent L. Baker/

Kent L. Baker
Registration No. 52,584
Phone 262-376-5170 ext. 15
klb@zpspatents.com

Dated: March 3, 2006
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.124

P.O. ADDRESS:

Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
14135 North Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53097-1416
262-376-5170